



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/475,206	12/30/1999	FEN-CHUNG KUNG	1999-0309	6067

7590 01/12/2005

MR. S. H. DWORETSKY  
AT&T CORP.  
BOX 4110  
MIDDLETOWN, NJ 07748

EXAMINER

BOAKYE, ALEXANDER O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2667

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/475,206

Applicant(s)

KUNG ET AL.

Examiner

Alexander Boakye

Art Unit

2666

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-14,17-28,30-33,44 and 45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-14,17-28, 30-33,44-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 10-7/23/09 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 44 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bartholomew et al. (US Patent # 6,215,858).

Regarding claims 27, 30, 31, 32, 44 and 45, Bartholomew discloses: a method of associating a directory number with multiple ports on an end user interface located at a customer premises (column 14, lines 53-62; column 28, lines 27-36 ; the claimed end user interface reads on multi-services platform; the claimed multiple ports correspond to telephone sets 131, 132 and 133 of Fig. 9), in a broadband communications system supporting Internet Protocol telephony service comprising the steps of: mapping the directory number with the multiple ports on the end user interface (column 17, lines 3-23), receiving an incoming call (column 15, lines 6-9 ), providing a greeting (column 18, lines 3-17), selecting a port using the greeting, and directing the incoming call to the selected port (column 17, lines 16-23).

Regarding claim 28, Bartholomew teaches alerting to the incoming call using a distinctive alert associated with the selected port (column 16, lines 10-24).

Regarding claim 33, Bartholomew teaches wherein each of the multiple ports includes a unique identity and displaying ( column 4, lines 39-55).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4-14 and 17-23, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubberly et al. (US Patent # 5,719,872) in view of Bartholomew (US Patent # 6,215,858).

Regarding claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 13, 10, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19 and 23, Dubberly discloses: an end user interface in a bi-directional broadband communication system (column 6, lines 32-35; column 8, lines 5-10 ) wherein the end user interface comprises: multiple ports ,at least one end user device connected to each port (column 24, lines 30-38), a transceiver (the claimed transceiver is inherent in the bi-directional communication system since the system transmit signals in both forward and reverse channels, see Figs. 3A-C). Dubberly differs from the claimed invention in that Dubberly does not disclose designation element as well as a processing unit, wherein the processing unit provides a greeting and route a signal received by the transceiver to one of the multiple ports selected by end user using the greeting.

However, Bartholomew discloses designation element as well as a processing unit, wherein the processing unit provides a greeting and route a signal received by the transceiver to one of the multiple ports selected by end user using the greeting (column 18, lines 3-18; column 17, lines 3-23; the claimed designation element corresponds to directory number or called number). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate designation element as well as a processing unit, wherein the processing unit provides a greeting and route a signal received by the transceiver to one of the multiple ports selected by end user using the greeting into the communication network of Bartholomew in order to provide facility for allowing personalized message to be used for individual incoming callers, which private messages are kept from other callers.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time the invention was made to incorporate designation element as well as a processing unit, wherein the processing unit provides a greeting and route a signal received by the transceiver to one of the multiple ports selected by end user using the greeting such as the one taught by Bartholomew into the communication network of Dubberly with the motivation being that it provides capability for the system to identify callers who are calling away from their home or business telephones.

Regarding claims 7, 8 and 20, Dubberly teaches that the at least one end user device provides a distinct alert (column 30, lines 56-67 ).

Regarding claim 21, Dubberly teaches that the distinct alert is a distinctive ring (column 30, lines 32-40; column 30, lines 56-67).

Art Unit: 2667

Regarding claims 9 and 22, Dubberly teaches end user interface (column 16, lines 42-48). What dubberly fails to disclose is displays. However, Bartholomew teaches displays. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate displays into the communication network of Dubberly in order to identify the called customer. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate displays such as the one taught by Bartholomew into the communication network of Dubberly with the motivation being that it provides capability for the system to filter out unwanted messages, thus enhancing efficiency.

Regarding claims 12 and 25, Dubberly teaches that at least one end user device includes one digital telephones (column 16, lines 42-48).

3. Claims 11 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubberly et al. (US Patent # 5,719,872) in view of Bartholomew (US Patent # 6,215,858).

Regarding claims 11, and 24, Dubberly discloses broadband communication system (column 20, lines 53- 60). What Dubberly fails to disclose is Internet protocol network supporting internet protocol telephony service. However, Bartholomew discloses Internet protocol network supporting internet protocol telephony service (see 414 of Fig. 9). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate internet protocol network supporting internet protocol telephone service in the communication network of Dubberly order to offer cheaper internet services. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 2667

invention was made to incorporate internet protocol network supporting internet protocol telephony service such as the one taught by Bartholomew into the communication network of Dubberly with the motivation being that it allows the integration of voice, data, and video over a single set of access and transport facilities, thus enhancing efficiency.

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,4-14,17-28, 30-33 and 44-45 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

**Conclusion**

5. Any inquiry concerning this application or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Boakye whose telephone number is (571) 272-3183. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:30am to 6:00pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chi Pham can be reached on (571) 272-3179. The fax number is (703) 872-9314. Any inquiry of a general or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750.

Alexander Boakye

Patent Examiner

AB

1/7/05

  
CHI PHAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600 1/9/05